



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/035.903	12/31/2001	Steven E. Smith	TI-32682	2175
23494	7590	11/08/2004	EXAMINER	
TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED			ABRAMS, NEIL	
P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999			ART UNIT	
DALLAS, TX 75265			PAPER NUMBER	
			2839	

DATE MAILED: 11/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/035,903

Applicant(s)

SMITH ET AL.

Examiner

Neil Abrams

Art Unit

2839

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 8-16-2004
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed. 18-21
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected. 1, 3-17, 24-28
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to. 2, 4, 22, 23
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Claims 1, 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Swanson.

Swanson system includes ball/component 9, 14, 18, socket 23, collar 22 (36) shown with springs 37 and to be mounted to socket 23 to capture the ball. All features shown by Swanson and should issues arise, also obvious to form Swanson with recited features such as with springs 37 arranged "symmetrically" ~~arranged~~ about the opening.

For claim 10, 14, bulb 14 is read as optical component; further obvious to use Swanson for varied types of items of items including those listed in spec, page 1. Claim 11, note circular opening 28. Claims 12, 13, obvious to choose necessary materials. Claim 15, the springs are fin shaped.

Should the matter be at issue note that part 21 of Swanson may be omitted.

Claims 3, 5-9, 16, 17, 24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swanson in view of Oda and Peek.

For claim 3, 5, 6 obvious to form Swanson socket opening 28 with raised areas to lessen friction in view of Oda at 28, 26. Claims 7, 8, 9 relate to obvious selection of materials for the socket. Steel and brass are standard for sockets. Plastic use suggested by Peek.

Claims 1 and 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fliehm in view of Oka, and Swanson.

Fliehm discloses socket B2 (fig. 9) ball c and collar M with fins to hold the ball to socket to support optical item E (camera). Obvious to form the fins to be resilient in view of Swanson at 37 and Oka at 9a to better hold the ball in selected positions.

Claims 12, 13 relate to obvious choice of material. Claim 11 opening B2 is circular at rim.

Claims 3-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fliehmann in view of Oka, Swanson, Oda and Peek.

For claims 3, etc, obvious to form the socket B2 with raised portions in view of Oda to lower friction. Use of selected materials relates to obvious variation. For claim 9, Peek applied as above.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: claims 2, 18, 22 combinations together with securement (welding) of springs to ball" is not taught or suggested by prior art. Use of ball bearings in main reference sockets also nonobvious in view of prior art.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Claims 18-21 are allowed.

Claims 2, 4, 22 and 23 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 2839

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Neil Abrams at telephone number (571)272-2089.

Abrams/ds

10/26/04

  
NEIL ABRAMS  
EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 322